



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/692,494	10/19/2000	Kristine B. Fuimaono	39716/KMO/W112	6739
23363	7590 10/25/2002	•		
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP 350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD SUITE 500			EXAMINER	
			RODRIGUEZ,	RODRIGUEZ, CRIS LOIREN
PASADENA,	CA 91105		. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S.M.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/692,494	FUIMAONO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Cris L. Rodriguez	3763			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cov r sheet with th c	orrespond nce address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply 1 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply wifthin the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 J	<u>uly 2002</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11,12,17,18,26,27 and 30-63</u> is/are p	ending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>11,12,26,27,43-46,52</u>		rom consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17,18,30-42,47-51,56 and 61-63</u> is/ard	e rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		•			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2000 is/are:	a) accepted or b) objected to t	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	ly to this Office action.				
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Application	on No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).			
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	visional application has been rec	eived.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			
S. Patent and Trademark Office					

Application/Control Number: 09/692,494

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of species B)figures 4-6, claims 17, 18, 30-42, 47-51, 56, and 62-63 in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it would have not being undue burden for the Examiner to search the species of figures 7-8. This is not found persuasive because it would have been a burden for the examiner to search for two species.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

- 2. Claims 11, 12, 26, 27, 43-46, 52-55, and 57-60 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 10.
- 3. Please, note that claims 11, 12, 26, 27, 43-46, 52-55, and 57-60 have been withdrawn from consideration by the examiner as been drawn to a non-elected species.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference numeral "52" is not shown as set forth on page 8 line 1. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/692,494

Art Unit: 3763

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 17, 18, 30-42, 47-51, 56, and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haissaguerre et al (US 6,068,629) in view of Swanson et al (US 6,428,537).

Haissaguerre discloses electrophysiology catheters and method for atrial fibrillation treatment in the heart. The catheters have a generally rigid probe body (the proximal end portion is stiffer than the distal end portion), a flexible irrigation tube fixedly attached to the distal end of the probe body and having at least irrigation openings, an infusion tube75, and an electrode having a metal ribbon around to irrigation tube (fig. 3, 16A-17, and 19A-B). However, Haissaguerre fails to disclose the irrigation tube forming a loop, the length of the probe and the diameter of the loop, the step of opening the heart of the patient, the metal ribbon made of nitinol, and the probe tubular body can be malleable.

Swanson teaches electrophysiology catheter systems and probes, and methods for treatment of atrial fibrillation in the heart. Swanson made a distinction between catheters and probes, and also set forth that the catheters configuration can be made as probes (see column 24). Swanson teaches several embodiments, but see more specifically to figs. 9, 11, and 23. It is also included a loop-shaped probe (fig 23), and that the probe tubular body can be rigid or malleable. Also, it is inherent that if the probe is going to be rigid and is going to be used for atrial fibrillation in the heart, the heart has to be opened. Given the teachings, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Haissaguerre' catheter's configuration with Swanson's loop

Application/Control Number: 09/692,494

Art Unit: 3763

configuration, since applicant has not disclosed that such solve any stated problem or is anything more than one of numerous shapes or configurations a person ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of atrial fibrillation. *In re Dailey and Eilers*, 149 USPQ 47 (1966). Furthermore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the catheter with the claimed diameters and length, since such modification would have involved a mere change in the size of the catheter and loop. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Also, the selection of a nitinol material for the ribbon has been rendered as an obvious design choice, since the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a *prima facie* obviousness determination in *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Avitall('883, '127, and '924), Carner et al, Stewart et al, Fleischman et al, Whayne et al, Pomeranz, Pomeranz et al, and Swanson et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cris L. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 308-2194. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (703) 308-3552. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3590 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

October 10, 2002

Cris L. Rodriguez Examiner Art Unit 3763

MICHAEL J. HAYES PRIMARY EXAMINER